

THE UNGODLY IRRATIONALITY SURROUNDING UNWANTED INFANTS

Eric Lyons, M.Min.

To say that the descendants of Abraham were growing in number is an understatement. According to Exodus 1:7, while in Egypt “the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, multiplied and grew exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them.” The more the Egyptians afflicted them, “the more they multiplied and grew” (1:12; cf. 1:20). As Jehovah had promised, the “few” had become a “mighty” nation of “many” (Genesis 46:3; Deuteronomy 26:5)—so many, in fact, that the “Egyptians were in dread of the children of Israel” (Exodus 1:12). Even Pharaoh became alarmed to the point that on two different occasions he called for the slaughter of all male Israelite newborns. In an attempt to thwart Divine Providence’s promised growth of Israel (Genesis 12:2; 22:17; 46:3), Pharaoh took it upon himself to call on “all his people” to throw Israel’s neonatal sons into the river (Exodus 1:22). Infanticide ensued. “Drown the Hebrew infants.” “Destroy those abominable babies” (cf. Genesis 43:32). “Feed them to the crocodiles.”

Some 80 years later, God severely punished Egypt for their wrongdoings. He brought ten dreadful plagues upon Pharaoh and all his land (Exodus 7-12). Moses described God’s “great” and “mighty” judgment upon Egypt as

“the chastening of the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 7:19; 11:2). The psalmist wrote how God “cast on them [the Egyptians] the fierceness of His anger, wrath, indignation, and trouble, by sending angels of destruction among them. He made a path for His anger; He did not spare their soul from death, but gave their life over to the plague, and destroyed all the firstborn in Egypt” (78:49-51). Granted, Egypt’s sins were many—from their idolatry, to their mistreatment of the Hebrews, to their refusal to let God’s people leave Egypt—but do not think for a minute that Jehovah had forgotten Egypt’s massacre of Abraham’s innocent descendants. Those precious children were “a heritage from the Lord” (Psalm 127:3). Jehovah had “graciously given” them to Israel (cf. Genesis 33:5). He created them in His own image and gave them life (Genesis 1:26-27; Acts 17:25; Ecclesiastes 12:7)—life that Pharaoh had **no right to choose** to take from them (only God has that right; see Butt, 2009, 29[12]:89-95).

Three thousand six hundred years ago, Egypt was plagued with baby murderers. From the tyrannical king, to all those who assisted him in drowning Israelite infants in the Nile River, Egypt revealed itself as a **bloodthirsty** country. (Interestingly, the first punishing plague God sent upon Egypt was turning water to **blood**, while the last

was striking down all of Egypt’s **first-born**.) Scripture repeatedly affirms that God detests the sin of murder. In patriarchal times, murder was wrong, and punishable by death: “Whoever sheds man’s blood, by man his blood shall be shed” (Genesis 9:6). Under the Law of Moses, the prohibition of murder was listed as one of the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20:13), and likewise carried a punishment of death (Numbers 35:30). The wisest man who ever lived (aside from Jesus, of course) noted in the Old Testament

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

*The Ungodly Irrationality
Surrounding Unwanted Infants*

Eric Lyons 41

DEPARTMENTS

Speaking Schedules 45

Note from the Editor

Advanced Reader Series Released 48

RESOURCES

Response to “Insect Wing Evolution
Revealed in Recycled Genes” 21-R

In the News 24-R

WWW.APOLOGETICSPRESS.ORG THE U

book of Proverbs: “[T]he Lord hates... hands that shed innocent blood” (6:16-17; cf. 1 Kings 3:12). According to the New Testament, governments have the God-given authority to take away the physical life of murderers (Romans 13:4). Furthermore, impenitent murderers will also “have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death” (Revelation 21:8). From Genesis through Revelation, God emphasized the sanctity of human life, while simultaneously making clear His hot displeasure with those who disregard it.

CREATED IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

In ancient Egypt, only Pharaoh was considered to be like a god, the supposed incarnation of the Sun god, Ra. Pharaoh also was thought to be the sole person who bore “the image of god.” The Egyptian canal digger and the merchant, the taskmaster and the Hebrew slave, all were thought innately inferior because they were not divine image bearers (or so they had been told). Such a designation was not applied to the common man in Egypt, nor anywhere else for that matter. Outside the Bible, archaeologists and historians have never found where mankind in general was said to

have been created in the “image” of a particular god. Three Akkadian texts from the Sargonic period of Assyria’s history use the Akkadian cognate of *tselem* (“image”), but it is employed only in a context where kings are being discussed (Miller, 1972, 91:294-295). The rulers of empires were the sole beings referred to as “images” of gods.

According to the first chapter of the Bible, however, the Creator of the Universe has honored **all** humans by endowing them with certain qualities that are intrinsic to His nature. Genesis 1:26-27 describes **all** mankind with language that previously had been applied only to the supreme rulers of nations:

Then God said, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

Make no mistake: “In the day that God created man, He made him in the likeness of God” (Genesis 5:1). [For a discussion of what being made in the image of God means, see Lyons and Thompson, 2002.] Thousands of

years after Creation, James warned Christians not to curse men because they “are made after the likeness of God” (3:9, ASV, emp. added). [NOTE: The English verb “are made” (ASV) derives from the Greek *gegonotas*, which is the perfect participle of the verb *ginomai*. The perfect tense in Greek is used to describe an action brought to completion in the past, but whose effects are felt in the present.] Although Adam and Eve are the only two humans to have been specially created by God (Genesis 2:7,21-22), all humanity shares the honor of being made in God’s likeness—which is why God condemns murder. Following the Flood, God said, “Whoever sheds man’s blood, by man his blood shall be shed; for in the image of God He made man” (Genesis 9:6, emp. added). Murder is forbidden because man is made in the image of God.

The newborns that Pharaoh drowned in ancient Egypt were Divine image bearers. Likewise, the infants that Herod slew some 1,500 years later also bore the likeness of God (Matthew 2:13-17). They were all 100% human beings. They were not rocks or plants. They were not animals. They were not merely blobs of living tissue. They were humans who had been given living spirits by “the Father of spirits” (Hebrews 12:9). What’s more, these babies were pure and sinless. They were (by creation) children of God, who had never separated themselves from Him (Ezekiel 18:20; cf. Matthew 18:3-5), and who now live in the afterlife in paradise (cf. 2 Samuel 12:23).

ABORTION

Pharaoh slaughtered infants for population control purposes. Herod butchered babies in hopes of killing the King of kings. These men were wicked rulers who implemented hideous policies and practices. However, what is taking place in America today is no less revolting. The morally inept leadership of the United States, and those who willfully chose to put them into office, are just as guilty as the

Reason & Revelation is published monthly by Apologetics Press, Inc. Periodicals postage paid at Montgomery, AL. **POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to **Reason & Revelation**, 230 Landmark Dr., Montgomery, AL 36117; **ISSN:** [1542-0922] **USPS#** 023415.

Apologetics Press is a non-profit, tax-exempt work dedicated to the defense of New Testament Christianity. Copyright © 2010. All rights reserved.

Editor:

Dave Miller, Ph.D.*
(*Communication, Southern Illinois University)

Associate Editor:

Kyle Butt, M.A.*
(*New Testament, Freed-Hardeman University)

Annual Subscription Rates:

\$10.00	Domestic
\$ 8.00	Domestic Bulk (5+ to same address)
\$16.00	Canada & Overseas Airmail

General inquiries, changes of address, or international callers:

Phone: (334) 272-8558
Fax: (334) 270-2002

Orders:

Phone: (800) 234-8558
Fax: (800) 234-2882

On-line Web store/catalog, subscription order/renewal form, current issues, archives, and other information (all orders processed on a secure server):

URL: www.ApologeticsPress.org
URL: www.ApologeticsPress.org/espanol
E-mail: mail@ApologeticsPress.org

Discovery—Scripture & Science for Kids is a sister publication for children. For more information, please contact our offices or visit the Discovery Web site at:

URL: www.DiscoveryMagazine.com



bloodthirsty, tyrannical baby killers of the past. Why? Because every year in America far more babies are brutally murdered than were killed in Egypt and Palestine in the days of Moses and Jesus.

More than one million innocent, unborn children are slaughtered each year in the United States of America (“Facts...,” 2008). In 2008, Guttmacher Institute reported that “from 1973 through 2005, more than 45 million legal abortions occurred” (“Facts...”). Forty-five million! That is more people than currently reside in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Tennessee...**combined**. The murder of unborn children has occurred with such frequency since the Supreme Court legalized abortion in 1973 that few people ever stop to consider the brutality involved. I recently became aware of one high school student who went to school pregnant, left to have an abortion, then returned to finish the school day. (No, her parents were not informed of her “choice” beforehand.) “Just a casual procedure in a doctor’s office, that’s all it was.”

In truth, there is nothing casual about the slaughter of an innocent child. Have you ever considered what mothers and doctors do in order to abort a baby? (Most abortionists don’t want you to know, much less see, how abortions are performed!) In a murderous abortion procedure called “suction aspiration,” doctors use a knife-like device, and suction from a powerful hose and pump (“29 times more powerful than a household vacuum cleaner”—“Abortion Methods,” 2010), to chop and suck a baby out of the mother’s womb. In the “dilation and evacuation” abortion procedure, doctors actually use plier-like devices to twist and tear four-month-old unborn babies into pieces. Usually this requires crushing the baby’s skull and snapping the child’s spine in order to extract them. When mothers choose to abort their unborn babies who are older

than four months, doctors often use a procedure called “saline injection” (i.e., salt poisoning). The strong salt solution that doctors inject through the mother’s abdomen acts as a corrosive and burns the baby inside and out. Normally, the child will suffer for an hour or more before dying. However, in some cases the children survive and are born alive. In most of these instances, they are helplessly left to themselves to die outside the womb. Still, a few have survived and lived to tell their story (see “Gianna Jessen,” 2006). When performing partial-birth abortions doctors normally deliver all of the baby except the head, then puncture the base of the skull with a pair of scissors, before removing the child’s brain with a hollow tube (“Abortion Methods,” 2010). This is sick! This is sadistic! Today’s abortions make Pharaoh’s command to cast the neonatal Israelites into the river sound like compassionate killing. No doubt, the cries of America’s innocent infants are being heard by the Creator. The shed blood of these blameless babies has been witnessed by our holy, just God who “hates...hands that shed innocent blood” (Proverbs 6:16-17).

THE HUMANITY OF THE UNBORN

Some people believe that unborn humans at various embryonic stages are more animal-like than human. Ernst Haeckel first proposed this idea in the latter part of the 1800s. He insisted that what lived inside a woman during her pregnancy was not human until the latter part of the gestation period. Even though science disproved Haeckel’s ridiculous idea long ago, it is a myth “popular culture has never fully abandoned” (Gould, 2000, 109[2]:44). Sadly, some pro-abortionists still try to comfort themselves by insisting that the human embryo may be going through the stages of our **alleged** evolutionary ancestors, and thus they supposedly are not really human when aborted (see Jackson, n.d.). Other pro-abortionists seem happy to just take a “leap of

faith” and hope that what is inside a pregnant woman is not a living, human being. Still others, like pro-abortion President Barak Obama, claim not to know when an unborn child is fully human. In a Presidential Candidates Forum on August 16, 2008, President Obama declared that knowing when an unborn child deserves human rights is “above my pay grade” (“Saddleback...”). Though the President claims ignorance on the matter, his hypocritical actions speak volumes: he still strongly supports pro-abortion policies. If President Obama truly does not know when an unborn infant deserves human rights, then why is he “a consistent champion” of allowing millions of Americans to mutilate their unborn children (“Women,” 2009)?

The fact is, common sense, science, and Scripture all show that an unborn embryo/baby is a living, human being. Do nonliving beings hiccup, suck their thumbs, or respond to touch, pain, cold, sound, and light? Of course not. Yet unborn babies do all of these things (see “Fetal Development,” 2003). They have a beating heart and a working brain. They are, beyond any doubt, **living, human beings!** Only the cold, callous heart would think otherwise. [For information on life beginning at conception, see Major, 1995.]

Although she recanted her views about abortion several years ago, relatively few people know that “Jane Roe,” the pseudonym that Norma McCorvey assumed as the lead plaintiff in the infamous *Roe v. Wade* case, no longer supports abortion. After over 20 years of supporting the pro-abortion platform, McCorvey suddenly began opposing abortion and has been for several years now. Why did this pro-abortion poster child become pro-life? What led to her change in thinking? Why does she now adamantly oppose the slaughtering of innocent unborn babies? According to McCorvey, the “straw that broke the camel’s back” came while she was working in an abortion clinic and was instructed to enter



a room where aborted fetuses were kept. Her assignment was to count the body parts of an infant that had just been aborted—to make sure the doctor had retrieved the entire baby from the mother's womb. McCorvey, who had previously worked in at least three other abortion clinics, stated, "I went back to the parts room, and **I looked at this tiny little infant**, and I freaked" (as quoted in McGrew, 2002, emp. added). "Jane Roe," the woman who symbolized a woman's right to have an abortion (i.e., **Roe v. Wade**), was forced to look upon the body parts of an aborted "fetus" and became convinced that it was a human being. Why? Because it **looked** like a human being. Unborn babies **look** like humans beings because they **are** human beings!

When Samuel Armas was a 21-week unborn baby, *USA Today* photojournalist Michael Clancy snapped what arguably would become the most famous pre-natal photograph ever. On August 19, 1999, Dr. Joseph Bruner, of Vanderbilt University Medical Center in Nashville, Tennessee, performed spina bifida surgery on Samuel while he was *in utero*. During the surgery, Samuel, who was only about half way through the normal gestation period, was pictured with his tiny hand resting on one of the doctor's fingers. Samuel was born 15 weeks later. When Samuel's surgery was first reported more than 10 years ago, many eyes were opened to the preciousness and humanity of early unborn children (for more information, see Miller, 2009). More recently, however, another baby, who further testifies to the humanity of unborn children, captured the headlines. Her name: Amillia Sonja Taylor. She was born on October 24, 2006 in south Florida. What makes Amillia so special? Doctors believe she "spent less time in the womb than any other surviving infant" ("Florida Baby...", 2007). Amillia's mother, Sonja, carried Amillia for less than 22 weeks. At delivery, she was only 9½ inches long and weighed less than a can of soda.

But, she was a living human being. Four months later, Amillia weighed 4½ pounds, was 15½ inches long, and was almost ready to go home for the very first time ("Doctors Extend..."). Two years later, she was a healthy toddler ("Amillia...").

Amillia did not **turn** into a human 15 to 18 weeks later—when most babies are delivered—she **was** a human at 22 weeks, had been human since she was conceived, and deserved rights like any other human. She was not lifeless matter—a mere blob of tissue. She was not a plant. She was not an animal. She was a living, growing human being. Millions of "Samuel Armases" and "Amillia Taylors" have been brutally mutilated on the holy grail of a "woman's right to choose." How can anyone look at pictures of an unborn child such as Samuel Armas, or a 10-ounce baby such as Amillia Taylor, and come to the conclusion that at 22 weeks old they are not human beings?

Consider some things that science has discovered about unborn babies in the first trimester of a mother's pregnancy.

Day 22—heart begins to beat with the child's own blood, often a different type than the mother's

Week 5—eyes, legs, hands begin to develop

Week 6—brain waves detectable; mouth, lips present; fingernails forming

Week 7—eyelids, toes form; nose distinct, baby kicking and swimming

Week 8—every organ in place; bones begin to replace cartilage, fingerprints begin to form

Weeks 9 and 10—teeth begin to form, fingernails develop; baby can turn head, frown

Week 11—baby can grasp objects placed in hand; all organ systems functioning; the baby has fingerprints, a skeletal structure, nerves, and circulation

Week 12—the baby has all of the parts necessary to experience pain, including the nerves, spinal cord and thalamus ("Diary of an Unborn Baby," n.d.).

In addition to the support that common sense and science give for the living humanity of unborn children, Scripture is equally clear on the subject. Seven hundred years before Christ, the prophet Isaiah said of himself: "**Before I was born the Lord called me**; from my birth he has made mention of my name" (49:1, emp. added). Similarly, several years later, the prophet Jeremiah spoke of how the Lord knew of him *in utero*: "Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying: 'Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; **before you were born I sanctified you**; I ordained you a prophet to the nations'" (Jeremiah 1:5, emp. added). The Creator of life has testified through inspiration that He views pre-born infants as living, human beings—real people whom He calls, sanctifies, and ordains. Had the mothers of Isaiah and Jeremiah aborted them, they would have been unlawfully taking the lives of precious children.

God made this equally clear in the Law of Moses. In fact, he specifically addressed the life and value of an unborn child in Exodus 21:22-23. He informed Moses: "If men fight, and hurt a woman with child, so that she gives birth prematurely, yet no harm follows, he shall surely be punished accordingly as the woman's husband imposes on him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. But if any harm follows, then you shall give life for life." Notice how God equates the life of all humans—both the unborn and the already born: "life for life," He said. If God did not view a "premature" baby as a living human being, then one could not take "life for life." Rather, it would be more like "a living human for a blob of matter." But unborn children are not merely blobs of tissue; they are lovely, living, human beings (cf. Miller, 2004).



Response to “Insect Wing Evolution Revealed In Recycled Genes”

Jerry Fausz, Ph.D.

[EDITOR’S NOTE: A.P. auxiliary staff scientist Dr. Fausz holds a Ph.D. in Aerospace Engineering from Georgia Tech.]

The title of this article, written by Dan Vergano and published in the Science section of *USA Today* (2010, 28[137]:5D), suggests that scientists at Japan’s RIKEN Center for Developmental Biology in Kobe have “revealed” wing evolution in insects, while the text of the article falls well short of supporting the title’s claim. The article does, on the other hand, indicate that the research of these scientists answers the criticism of “some religious writers,” such as Matthew Vanhorn, a former intern of Apologetics Press (Vanhorn, 2004).

The RIKEN Center researchers, as discussed in the article, dissected insect eggs to determine the gene that “turned on” as wings developed in mayflies, and which gene shut down in wingless silverfish. According to Vergano, the researchers did this “to test the two current theories to explaining insect wing origins.” One of these theories suggests that wings “developed from the back shell of insects,” while the other theory suggests that wings “are modified extensions” of insect legs.

According to Vergano, the researchers “conclude the answer is a mixture of both theories.” The term “conclude” here is a bit strong considering that the strongest claims made in the article for the research are “they **may** now have the answer [to insect flight evolution—JF]” and “just two genes **may** explain insect wings” (p. 5, emp. added). Such non-committal hesitation hardly qualifies as a scientific conclusion, and certainly does not support the title’s claim that insect wing evolution has been “revealed.”

In fact, their “conclusion” is seen to be less than weak considering that it is partly based on the idea that “both genes were already present in the wingless ancient ancestor of today’s flying bugs” (p. 5). If these scientists are searching for an explanation of the origin of insect wings, how is it that they already “know” that the insects they are studying have a common ancestor? Moreover, how do they **know** that this ancestor was flightless? Perhaps, these claims are supported by the fossil record? No, Vergano states in his article that “the fossil record offers **no clues** to [insect wing—JF] origin” (p. 5, emp. added).

In truth, this article illustrates a quite common feature of evolution research, in which the “conclusions” of the research are very often supported by the **assumption** that

Darwinism is true. Even more, it is an artifact of what could be more generally called “model based science.” Origins are not testable or repeatable (i.e., not directly subject to the scientific method), so researchers create models based on their hypotheses and test **the models** instead. However, when a researcher has complete freedom to assume a set of initial conditions, and then modify many of the parameters of his model with impunity, it is very often a simple matter to make the model fit any set of empirical observations. In particular, if the initial conditions represent what the theory is, in fact, trying to verify, the results are not much in doubt. The result is a theory that cannot be proven wrong, because the model can always be adjusted to accommodate changing information. This observation describes Darwinism.

It is equally typical of those who support Darwinism, like Vergano, to cover such weaknesses within Darwinism by marginalizing those who criticize it. For instance, notice that Vergano groups Matthew Vanhorn with “some religious writers,” while quoting evolutionary biologist Elizabeth Jockusch, of the University of Connecticut to say, “Most **mainstream experts** think this is just the sort of thing that leads to new structures” (p. 5, emp. added.) The staff scientists at Apologetics Press, who happen to agree with Matthew Vanhorn’s observations, may be included in Mr. Vergano’s characterization of “some religious writers,” but who also hold Ph.D. and M.S. degrees in a variety of fields including Biochemistry, Geology, and Nuclear, Aerospace, and Mechanical Engineering. Furthermore, A.P. staff scientists work in the **mainstream** of their chosen disciplines. It is quite easy for someone to **claim** that they speak for the “mainstream,” but significantly more difficult to justify that claim.

Mr. Vergano’s article also makes the tacit assumption that explaining the origin of wings is equivalent to explaining the origin of flight. Darwinists often naively equate the development of structure with the development of capability. Flight, however, is a function that requires much more than just having wings, as human beings have (often painfully) discovered. Creatures developing the brain capacity and “know how” to fly via evolutionary processes are just as unlikely and improbable as the development of flight structures—and the two must occur concurrently to hold any benefit for the animal.



The weaknesses of evolutionary theory, as illustrated by Vergano's article, and the vast inherent improbability that structure and capability would develop concurrently, suggest a more rational conclusion than one of common ancestry. The structure necessary for and the capability of flight, suggest design—and therefore a Designer. Evidence for design in nature is overwhelming, but will never be found by those who begin their search with the assumption that it is not there.

REFERENCES

- Vanhorn, Matthew (2004), "The Evolution of Insect Flight," [On-line], URL: <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2534>.
 Vergano, Dan (2010), "Insect Wing Evolution Revealed in Recycled Genes," *USA Today*, 28[137]:5D, [On-line], URL: http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/columnist/vergano/2010-03-26-wings29_ST_COLUMN_N.htm.

IN THE NEWS

The fact that the Bible is the inspired, inerrant Word of God has been established repeatedly and definitively (see Butt, 2007). New evidence, however, continues to surface that adds weight to the cumulative case for the Bible's accuracy. Unfortunately, some of the "new evidence" turns out to be fabricated, based on incorrect information. Thus, it becomes imperative that those who defend the Bible's inspiration heed the words of Paul, when he admonished his readers to "test all things, hold fast what is good" (1 Thessalonians 5:21). God has provided plenty of evidence that establishes the Bible's inspiration, without resorting to claims that cannot be sustained or are simply false.

One example of such false information is currently circulating in e-mail form under the heading "Giants in the Land of Canaan." This e-mail purports to show that huge human skeletons have been uncovered that testify to the fact that there were once giants in the land of Canaan. The e-mail contains several pictures of people digging up these massive bones at archaeological dig sites. The photographs depict human skulls and skeletons that are as much as 20 times larger than the average human skull or skeleton.

This e-mail is simply not true. The original photographs were manipulated to look real for a photography contest (see "They Might Be Giants," 2010). The skeletons' sizes were exaggerated intentionally, and the original form of the pictures was recognized to be a manipulation. In the course of time, however, the fact that the skeleton pictures were fakes was lost, and many people have forwarded the e-mail as legitimate proof of the historical existence of giants. It is worth noting that the massive size of the skeletons depicted in the photographs is much larger than the biblical text suggests. For instance, the giant, Goliath, was said to be "six cubits and a span" (1 Samuel

17:4), or about nine and a half feet tall. Yet the proportions of the skeletons in the pictures shows one of the giants' head, by itself, to be about four feet tall, giving the giant an estimated height of about 20-30 feet. Such proportions do not fit the biblical description of giants (see Butt, 2003).

It is most likely the case that many sincere Bible believers have forwarded this e-mail, or others of a similar nature (see Thompson, 1999), without knowing the truth about them. In our zeal to defend the Bible's accuracy, let us make sure that we "test all things" and "hold fast" only to those evidences that are legitimate. In some cases, the "testing" of such evidence might mean little more than taking two minutes to search the Web to see what has been written on the topic. Often a two-minute Web search can save a person from having to issue an embarrassing apology to hundreds of friends to whom he forwarded an inaccurate e-mail. In addition, if you wonder about a certain piece of information, you can always contact Apologetics Press and ask about it, since we spend thousands of hours engaged in biblical research that the average Christian simply does not have the time to undertake. It is true that the Bible is God's Word, and that there were giants in the land of Canaan (Numbers 13:33), but the pictures being forwarded to that effect do not help make the case.

Kyle Butt

REFERENCES

- Butt, Kyle (2003), "How Big Is a Giant?" <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/1807>.
 Butt, Kyle (2007), *Behold! The Word of God* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press).
 "They Might Be Giants" (2010), <http://www.snopes.com/photos/odd/giantman.asp>.
 Thompson, Bert (1999), "Have Scientists Found Joshua's 'Missing Day'?" <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2217>.



When the angel Gabriel informed Mary about the pregnancy of her cousin, Elizabeth, the angel of God said that she had “conceived” (Luke 1:36). Conceived what? What was inside of Elizabeth? A mass of meaningless matter? A non-living non-human? An animal evolving into a person? What had Elizabeth conceived? Gabriel informed Mary that Elizabeth had “conceived **a son**.” What’s more, when Mary went to visit Elizabeth prior to the births of John the Baptizer and Jesus, Luke, the physician, called the unborn baby in Elizabeth’s womb a “babe,” and even noted that he “leaped in her womb” (Luke 1:41,44). Luke used this term (Greek *brephos*) at least four other times. Twice he used it in reference to Jesus lying in a manger after His birth (Luke 2:12,16), once when referring to young infants whose parents had sought the Lord’s blessings (Luke 18:15), and once in reference to the babies that Pharaoh had exposed in ancient Egypt (Acts 7:19; cf. Exodus 1:22).

In each of these cases, *brephos* refers to children, to boys and girls, to sons and daughters—to living human beings whom the psalmist said are fearfully and wonderfully made, formed, and woven by Almighty God (139:13-16). Man should be careful tampering with **Jehovah’s** creation whom **He** fashions in **His** image!

AMERICA, ABORTION, AND THE ABSURD

Mommas Can Murder, But Daddies Can’t?

Few things enrage a community more than finding out that a pregnant woman has been murdered. Towns struck with such an atrocity often rise up and declare that justice must be served: “Violators should be charged with two counts of murder, not just one.” In recent times, men committing such heinous crimes have been charged with double murder. From Missouri to California, from Ohio to Utah, prosecutors have been pushing for maximum penalties by charging men, who allegedly have killed their **pregnant** wives (or girlfriends), with **two** counts of murder. Just last year, a California man was convicted of murdering both a mother and her unborn baby after he brutally stabbed the mother (and child) repeatedly with scissors (Ertelt, 2009).

It is encouraging to know that our judicial system has seen fit to prosecute those who murder unborn babies, and to make the guilty pay the highest penalties allowed. In these situations, our judicial system has treated the unborn baby as he/she really is—a human being. “A person guilty of murdering an unborn child is guilty of murdering a person.” This is what we are being told over and over again by those who seek to charge men, who take the lives of a woman and her unborn baby, with double murder.

But wait a minute! How can an unborn child be considered a human being in one situation (when a man takes the life of a woman and her baby), but then, when a pregnant woman wants to take the life of her unborn child, the baby becomes an “appendage” of the mother’s body? “The baby is not a human being, just an extra lump of tissue that the mother can discard at will.” If the father intentionally kicks a baby while in the mother’s womb, killing the child, he likely will be sentenced to prison, or possibly to death (and rightly so—Genesis 9:6). On the other hand, if a mother goes to an abortion clinic and pays a doctor to insert an instrument into her uterus literally to pull and shred the baby into pieces, snapping the spinal cord, and crushing the skull, she has done nothing illegal.

How, in the name of common sense, can our courts rule that when a woman takes the life of her own child, “it is a choice,” but when someone else takes that life, “it is murder”? Such reasoning makes no sense. Abortion-rights activists, at least, are consistent in this regard. As Heather Boonstra, senior public policy associate at the Alan Guttmacher Institute, stated: “The law cannot hold both that a pregnant woman is two persons and at the same time allow her to have an abortion” (as quoted in Simon, 2001).

Inhumane to Kill Dogs, but not Humans?

In August 2007, many people, including myself, were disappointed to learn that a well-known professional football player (Michael Vick) plead guilty to sponsoring, financing, and participating in the brutal sport of dog fighting. Vick even admitted that he was partly responsible for hanging and drowning a number of dogs that did not perform well in certain “test” fights (see *United States v. Michael Vick*). For his crimes, Vick was sentenced to 23 months behind bars, most of which were served in a federal prison in Leavenworth, Kansas.

SPEAKING SCHEDULES

Kyle Butt

June 6	Chattanooga, TN	(423) 825-0339
June 13-15	Florence, AL	(256) 766-9333
June 26	Pea Ridge, AR	(479) 451-8397

Eric Lyons

June 2	Mount Juliet, TN	(615) 758-2274
June 7-9	Montgomery, AL	(334) 272-5820
June 13-17	Jacksonville, AL	(256) 435-9356

Dave Miller

June 4-5	Dallas, TX	(214) 391-4122
June 11-12	Lorain, OH	(440) 225-8541
June 18-20	Vacaville, CA	(707) 448-5085
June 25-27	Morro Bay, CA	(805) 772-7248



I certainly believe that Vick's actions (i.e., the drowning of dogs, etc.) can be described as appalling and somewhat sadistic. What's more, he knowingly participated in a sport which has been outlawed in every state in America. He deserved some kind of punishment for his actions. But, we must recognize that Vick's acts were done against **animals**. Though dogs may be "man's best friend" (and I happen to love dogs), they still are just animals—not humans. They are every bit as much an animal as cows, crows, chickens, deer, monkeys, horses, and pigs.

How absurd, inconsistent, and immoral is the United States' judicial system when a person must serve nearly two years in prison for fighting, hanging, and drowning **animals**, yet, if a woman slaughters a 22-week-old unborn **human**, she supposedly is blameless. The fact that doctors in the United States can legally rip unborn babies to pieces, chop them up with knife-like devices, or puncture their skulls with a pair of scissors before sucking out their brains, is atrocious. Are we to believe that Vick's actions against dogs were "**inhumane**," but what happens to approximately one million innocent, unborn babies every year in America is not? What could be more **inhumane** than willfully, selfishly, arrogantly, and brutally taking the life of a **human**—one of God's image-bearers (Genesis 1:26-27; 9:6)? Baby murderers freely walk the streets of America every day, but dog fighters are jailed for inhumane acts—against **animals**? How absurd!

Overpopulation Problem? Don't Pollute the Planet with Babies?

More than 3,500 years ago, Pharaoh observed that the children of Israel were growing and multiplying so rapidly that he became fearful of problems such a large number of slaves might cause. Exodus chapter one makes clear that Pharaoh gave two separate execution orders upon Israel's newborn sons because of what he perceived as an

overpopulation problem. Sadly, such "reasoning" is still used today.

In 2006, evolutionary environmentalist Dr. Eric Pianka was named the Distinguished Texas Scientist of the Year. At his award ceremony in Beaumont, Texas, attendee Forrest Mims reported how Pianka

began laying out his concerns about how human overpopulation is ruining the Earth. He presented a doomsday scenario in which he claimed that the sharp increase in human population since the beginning of the industrial age is devastating the planet. He warned that quick steps must be taken to restore the planet before it's too late. Professor Pianka said the Earth as we know it will not survive without drastic measures. Then, and without presenting any data to justify this number, he asserted that the only feasible solution to saving the Earth is to reduce the population to 10 percent of the present number.... His favorite candidate for eliminating 90 percent of the world's population is airborne Ebola (*Ebola Reston*), because it is both highly lethal and it kills in days, instead of years (Mims; cf. Butt, 2008).

Most people find Dr. Pianka's suggestions insane. Who in his right mind would propose spreading airborne Ebola around the planet for the purpose of reducing the world's population? Ridiculous? Before dismissing Texas' 2006 "Distinguished Scientist" as a raving lunatic, consider a more palatable form of population reduction.

In 1977, Paul and Anne Ehrlich and John Holdren (who currently serves as President Obama's "science czar") penned a book titled: *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, and Environment*. In the book, Holdren and the Ehrlichs assert that "there exists ample authority under which population growth could be regulated.... [U]nder the United States Constitution, effective population-control programs could be enacted" (p. 1280). What kind of "population-control programs" exactly? They specifically noted: "compulsory population-control laws, even including

laws requiring **compulsory abortion**," which "could be sustained under the existing constitution if the population crisis became sufficiently severe to endanger society" (p. 1280, emp. added). Is there really much difference between the Pharaoh of Exodus one and President Obama's science czar (cf. Matthew 5:21-22; 15:18)?

The United Kingdom's *Daily Mail* ran a story a few years back about a woman (Toni Vernelli) who "**terminated her pregnancy** in the firm belief she was **helping save the planet**" (as quoted in Courtenay-Smith and Turner, 2007, emp. added). According to Vernelli, "Having children is selfish.... Every person who is born uses more food, more water, more land, more fossil fuels, more trees and produces more rubbish, more pollution, more greenhouse gases, and adds to the problem of over-population" (2007). Vernelli indicated her desire to "save the planet—not produce a new life which would only add to the problem." She went on to describe procreation as "something negative" and claimed that there were many others with similar planet-saving ideas. The *Daily Mail* concurred, saying, "Toni is far from alone" (2007).

Thirty-one-year-old Sarah Irving was in complete agreement with Vernelli. "[A] baby," she said, "would **pollute the planet**.... [N]ever having a child was the most environmentally friendly thing I could do" (2007, emp. added). Sarah and her fiancé Mark Hudson told the *Daily Mail*, "In short, we do everything we can to reduce our carbon footprint. But all this would be undone if we had a child.... It would be **morally wrong** for me to add to climate change and the destruction of Earth" (emp. added). In the minds of environmentalists and atheists, including Freedom from Religion's President Dan Barker, murdering unborn children can be considered "progress" and a "blessing" (see Barker, 1992, p. 135; see also Barker and Rankin, 2006), while bringing children into the world may be "negative" and "morally wrong."



CONCLUSION

Some 2,700 years ago, the prophet Isaiah warned of those “who call evil good, and good evil; who put darkness for light, and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter...who are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight” (5:20-21). Sadly, Isaiah’s description of the ungodly fits America to a tee. In this country, we call unbridled lust “love,” we describe immodest apparel as “stylish,” we refer to homosexuals as being “gay,” and baby murderers we call “pro-choice”—protectors of “women’s rights.” (Whatever happened to children’s rights?)

What will become of those who “call evil good, and good evil”? What is God’s reaction to those who “rejoice in iniquity” rather than truth (1 Corinthians 13:6)? Isaiah spoke of God’s judgments and punishment:

Therefore, as the fire devours the stubble, and the flame consumes the chaff, so their root will be as rottenness, and their blossom will ascend like dust; because they have rejected the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel. Therefore the anger of the Lord is aroused against His people; He has stretched out His hand against them and stricken them, and the hills trembled. Their carcasses were as refuse in the midst of the streets (5:24-25).

According to the psalmist, “The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God” (9:17).

Both the Bible and history teach us that God does not tolerate wicked, bloodthirsty nations forever. He destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah with fire from heaven. He raised a mighty army to punish the wicked inhabitants of Canaan (Deuteronomy 9:4; 18:9-12). He sent “angels of destruction” upon Egypt, and gave them “over to the plague, and destroyed all the firstborn” (Psalm 78:49,51). What will be America’s fate? If our “Christian” country’s murderous methods do not cease, what can we expect? We can expect that God will severely judge

our nation in this life, while individually rendering “each one according to his deeds” in the afterlife (Romans 2:5-10). In the meantime, may our longsuffering Savior grant Christians the courage to “take up the whole armor of God” and “be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might” (Ephesians 6:13,10).

REFERENCES

- “Abortion Methods” (2010), <http://www.lifesitenews.com/abortiontypes/>.
- “Amillia Turns Two” (2008), <http://growingyourbaby.blogspot.com/2008/10/amillia-taylor-turns-2.html>.
- Barker, Dan (1992), *Losing Faith in Faith: From Preacher to Atheist* (Madison, WI: Freedom From Religion Foundation).
- Barker, Dan and John Rankin (2006), “Evolution and Intelligent Design: What are the Issues?” http://www.frf.org/about/bybarker/ID_Debate.mp3.
- Butt, Kyle (2008), “The Bitter Fruits of Atheism [Part 1],” *Reason & Revelation*, 28[7]:49-55, July, <http://www.apologeticsspress.org/articles/3740>.
- Butt, Kyle (2009), “Is God Immoral for Killing Innocent Children?” *Reason & Revelation*, 29[12]:89-95, December.
- Courtenay-Smith, Natasha and Morag Turner (2007), “Meet the Women Who Won’t Have Babies—Because They’re Not Eco Friendly,” *Daily Mail*, November 21, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/femail/article.html?in_article_id=495495&in_page_id=1879.
- “Diary of an Unborn Baby” (no date), *National Right to Life Foundation*, <http://www.nrlc.org/abortion/facts/fetusdevelopment.html>.
- “Doctors Extend Hospital Stay of Tiniest Premature Baby” (2007), *Associated Press*, February 20, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,252878,00.html>.
- Ehrlich, Paul, Anne Ehrlich, and John Holdren (1977), *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, and Environment* (San Francisco, CA: W.H. Freeman and Company), <http://www.scribd.com/doc/22480029/Ecoscience-Population-Resources-Environment-1649-Pgs-John-holdren>.
- Ertelt, Steven (2009), “California Man Convicted Killing Both Pregnant Girlfriend and Unborn Child,” <http://www.lifenews.com/state4210.html>.
- “Facts on Induced Abortions in the United States” (2008), *Alan Guttmacher Institute*, http://www.agi-usa.org/pubs/fb_induced-abortion.pdf.
- “Fetal Development: From Conception to Birth” (2003), *National Right to Life*, <http://www.nrlc.org/abortion/facts/fetaldevelopment.html>.
- “Florida Baby Delivered at 21 Weeks Won’t Go Home as Planned” (2007), *Associated Press*, February 20, http://www.usatoday.com/news/health/2007-02-20-tiny-baby_x.htm.
- “Gianna Jessen” (2006), <http://www.abortionfacts.com/survivors/giannajessen.asp>.
- Gould, Stephen Jay (2000), “Abscheulich! (Atrocious),” *Natural History*, 109[2]:42-50, March.
- Jackson, Wayne (no date), “The ‘Link’ Between Evolution and Abortion,” *Christian Courier*, <http://www.christiancourier.com/articles/958-the-link-between-evolution-and-abortion>.
- Lyons, Eric and Bert Thompson (2002), “In the ‘Image and Likeness of God’ [Parts I/II],” *Reason & Revelation*, March/April, 22:17-23,25-31.
- Major, Trevor (1995), “The Value of Early Human Life,” *Reason & Revelation*, 15[2]:9-15, February, <http://www.apologeticsspress.org/articles/259>.
- McGrew, Jannel (2002), “‘Jane Roe’ Tells Story of Change at Fundraiser,” *Prattville Progress*, May 1.
- Miller, Dave (2004), “Abortion and Exodus 21,” <http://www.apologeticsspress.org/articles/2598>.
- Miller, J. Maxwell (1972), “In the ‘Image’ and ‘Likeness’ of God,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, September, 91:289-304.
- Miller, Joshua Rhett (2009), “Ten Years Later, Boy’s ‘Hand of Hope’ Continues to Spark Debate,” *Fox News*, May 6, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,519181,00.html>.
- Mims, Forrest (2006), “Dealing with Doctor Doom,” *The Citizen Scientist*, http://www.sas.org/tcs/weeklyIssues_2006/2006-04-07/feature1p/index.html.
- “Saddleback Presidential Candidates Forum” (2008), August 16, <http://www.clipsandcomment.com/2008/08/17/full-transcript-saddleback-presidential-forum-sen-barack-obama-john-mccain-moderated-by-rick-warren/>.
- Simon, Stephanie (2001), “Debate Grows on Whether Fetuses Should Have Special Legal Status,” *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, 6A, June 17, <http://news.google.com/news/papers?id=1683&dat=20010617&id=G8AaAAAAIBA&csjd=XjAEAAAAIBA&pg=6739,6695111>.
- United States v. Michael Vick* (2007), 3:07CR274, <http://sports.espn.go.com/photo/2007/0824/vicksummary.pdf>.
- “Women” (2009), *The White House*, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/agenda/women>.





NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

APOLOGETICS
PRESS, INC.

ADVANCED READER SERIES RELEASED

Apologetics Press continues to consider the needs of young people. Perhaps more than ever before in American culture, children are coping with numerous subversive forces that threaten their faith. Parents can easily find themselves unprepared and ill-equipped to deal with the sophistication of some of these challenges. The staff at A.P. is blessed with the time and resources to meet these challenges. Our desire is to provide parents and their children with the necessary tools to deflect Satan's darts (Ephesians 6:16).

The sinister forces that vie for our children's allegiance are legion. They include the pervasive secularism that holds American culture in its grip, the massive propaganda machine of evolution, and the sexual anarchy that confronts society on every hand. We at A.P. are endeavoring to address each of these sinister ploys by developing materials that will give kids the truth. They deserve to have answers to their questions—God's answers and God's views.

We are pleased to announce the release of the second set of three volumes in our "Advanced Reader" children's reading books series: *The Amazing Human Body Designed by God*, *Amazing Migrating Animals Designed by God*, and *Amazing Copies of*

God's Design. As usual, these A.P. readers are well-written, beautifully illustrated, and God-centered. Like the "Learn to Read" and "Early Reader" books, these new volumes will nurture a child's spirit with the reality of God and His role in the Universe.

Please pause and give some thought to those in your acquaintance who have children or grandchildren who would profit from these books. You may well be responsible for stabilizing a soul for eternity.

Dave Miller



See the Center Spread
for More Details

